

7

## Remarks

The Applicant notes the Examiner's suggestion for rearrangement of the specification in accordance with 37 CFR 1.77(b). The Applicant, however, notes that this procedure is not mandatory. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to accept the specification in the instant form, since the Applicant believes that it is more appropriate for the particular case at hand. Review and acceptance is requested.

The Examiner has objected to the specification on page 18 with regard to reference symbols 13 and 13b, which has been corrected in this amendment. The Examiner has also objected to claim 46 and suggested a change which has been incorporated herein. The conditional "can be" in claims 40 and 41 leading to the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection has been corrected in the instant amendment.

Claims 29 through 31 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Burlew '195. Claims 32 through 38, 40 through 47 and 49 through 58 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burlew '195. Claims 39 and 48 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burlew '195 in view of Sherrod '047.

In responding to these rejections, the Applicant has amended Independent claim 29 to specify that the cavity is defined between the bristle support and the brush body. Moreover, the limitations of former claim 35 have been incorporated into amended claim 29. Claim 29 as amended is distinguished from the prior art of record for the following reasons.

## 8

Although Burlew teaches a toothbrush having a base, and a bristle support member made of rubber, the cavity in the bristle support is filled by the brush body to attach the bristle support to the brush body. Therefore, after the brush is assembled the cavity disappears. This prior art of reference therefore fails to read on claim 29 as amended, since claim 29 recites a cavity which is defined between the bristle support and the bristle body after the bristle support has been mounted to the brush body. Moreover, none of the prior art of record discloses a dividing wall within that cavity which subdivides the cavity into separate chambers.

The invention as claimed is sufficiently distinguished from the prior art of record to satisfy the requirements of 35 USC 102 as well as 35 USC 103. The dependent claims of record inherit the limitations of the base claim and are similarly distinguished from the prior art of record for the reasons given. Review, acceptance and passage to issuance is therefore respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added in this amendment.

9

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Vincent

Dr. Paul Vincent

Registration number 37,461

September 07, 2005

Date

Lichtl + Partner GbR

Patentanwälte

Postfach 41 07 60

D-76207 Karlsruhe, Germany

Telephone : +49-721-943 28 15

Fax: +49-721-943 28 40